DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 492 JC 730 130

AUTHOR Carlson, Dennis; Das, Deb
TITLE State Planning for the Disadvantaged. A Report of the National Dissemination Project for Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION Washington State Board for Community Coll. Education, Seattle. Research and Planning Office.
NOTE 45p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Check Lists; *Community Colleges; *Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Needs; Guides; *Models; Post Secondary Education; *Program Planning; *Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

Major elements in a general process model for state and local planning for minority and disadvantaged education are discussed. These elements are: (1) needs assessment and public discussion of issues, (2) state goals and objectives for disadvantaged education, (3) local community college goals, objectives, and commitments, (4) provision of strategic planning support to local colleges in program development, (5) evaluation of the planning process. To make planning as meaningful as possible, the following are suggested: (1) planning should always be tied to implementation; (2) the threat of change should be eliminated as much as possible; (3) planning should avoid being a "zero-sum game"; (4) planning should involve as many relevant agencies and groups as possible; (5) when possible, planning should make use of analogies between situations being dealt with and situations in other locations. Three appendixes provide: (A) A Survey of Educational Needs--Battelle Institute's Center for Improved Education; (B) A Proposed Method for Prioritizing Goals, Objectives, and Activities; and (C) State of Florida Guide for Local College Planning and Evaluation of Comprehensive Services to the Disadvantaged--Part I. Checklist for Planning Community College Services for the Disadvantaged; Part II. Projections for Programs for the Disadvantaged. (DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 077492

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STATE PLANNING
FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

A report of the
National Dissemination Project
for Community Colleges

By Dennis Carlson and
Deb Das.
Washington State Board
for Community College
Education.
Research and Planning Project.
Seattle, Washington.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 28 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC 730 130

FOREWORD

This report was prepared by the National Dissemination Project to suggest ways in which community college systems might better serve the needs of minority and disadvantaged students through planning.

The National Dissemination Project is an outgrowth of ten earlier Office of Economic Opportunity projects undertaken by state community college agencies to develop comprehensive planning capacities to serve the disadvantaged and to provide institutional support in program development. It has become obvious from the high drop out rate alone, which often approaches 90 percent for disadvantaged students compared with a 30 percent attrition rate for other students, that community colleges are not successfully meeting the educational and career needs of the disadvantaged students. A new approach to planning appears to be a critical need.

The lessons learned in the OEO planning projects as well as in other innovative programs and projects across the nation have been assessed by the National Dissemination Project. In total, visits have been made to over 100 community colleges in 16 states, and contacts established with state directors and concerned groups and agencies.

In this report, important planning concepts and techniques are briefly described based on project experiences. It is hoped that this will serve as an introduction and a focus for concern.

The National Dissemination Project will continue to provide resource information between now and August 1, 1973 in helping individuals, colleges and systems better serve minority and disadvantaged students. This will be done by providing information, contacts, and assistance in planning for change. For further information contact:

Deb K. Das, Project Director
Research and Planning Office
Washington State Board for
Community College Education
2722 Eastlake Avenue East
Seattle, Washington 98102
Telephone: (206) 464-7081

THE PROCESS OF CHANGE

A salient characteristic of American education today is its preoccupation with changing needs, changing expectations and changing roles. As a recent Educational Testing Service report concluded:

> "When one talks or writes about education these days, the temptation to use such phrases as innovation, educational ferment, technological revolution, or explosive growth is irresistible. One cannot avoid them, for explosive and revolutionary changes are occurring in education."*

But if change is a major preoccupation, planned change is a major need--particularly for those "New Students" from disadvantaged backgrounds now gaining access to higher education in increasing number. Obviously, as individuals with new needs are served, old values must be altered, additional offerings must be provided, programs must be modified, and new methods employed.

The OEO state planning projects were based on the thesis that what is needed now, as much as a description of problems and a call for new solutions, is an exploration of the process of planned change. Just as important as the question of <u>what</u> should be done are the questions of <u>who</u> shall decide and <u>how</u>.

---

* Educational Testing Service Annual Report: 1965-66, Princeton, N.J., 1967, p. 9.

Who should decide? A significant finding of this study is that the level of involvement in determining community college policy is almost uniformly de-emphasized. The impetus for change or maintenance of the status quo has come from a core of inside professional educators and administrators, and decisions are made without significant community involvement--particularly from minority and disadvantaged segments of the community.

In many cases, when the community has sought active involvement in determining needs and priorities, it has been stymied by a lack of visible decision-making, a shortage of information on issues, and a deficiency in the channels of participation.

As the system exists today it seems clear that it cannot effectively respond to the pressing demands being made on it by an increasingly concerned community. The community will no longer accept on faith the idea that the college serves it. If disadvantaged segments of the community are de-emphasizing confrontation politics, they are replacing it with an increasing concern for continuing involvement in termining the nature of community college services, to insure that the college is responsive to their needs as they see and feel them.

The OEO project experiences suggest that the community can be most fruitfully involved in that part of the planning process relating to needs assessment and goal formation. Several channels of involvement will be suggested in this report.

How should we decide? A second major conclusion of this study is that few states and few community college systems have established goals for disadvantaged education, and fewer yet

are applying an adequate planning process to meet the needs of the disadvantaged.

The OEO planning projects attempted to ameliorate this situation, although they were frustrated in some instances by a lack of aggressive state leadership, resistance in local community colleges, and a misunderstanding of planning needs.

In many instances, inadequate funding is given as an excuse for doing little to change the present system. This reasoning is particularly frustrating to minority and disadvantaged groups who would benefit most from change.

To those who propose change, the reply is often standard: "Yes, the idea has merit, but there simply is not enough money to do all the things we might like to do." Unfortunately, there never will be "enough" money, which is all the more reason to make optimum use of scarce resources through planning.

In those colleges visited and those systems reviewed by the National Dissemination Project, lack of adequate planning was often associated with minimal student achievement, a high level of student dissatisfaction, and a neglect of the needs of various community groups. This was true irregardless of how much money was spent by the college or system.

An analogy may be drawn with another educational system--the New York City Publiich School System--studied by Mario Fantini. Fantini noted that the New York City school budget more than doubled during the 1960's, per pupil expenditures rose the $1,000 per pupil level (above most other cities and even some suburban school

districts), and many programs were initiated to meet the supposed needs of minority and disadvantaged students. Yet during the same period, student achievement did not appreciably change, the system appeared to be drifting without any coherent or cohesive guiding policy, and community dissatisfaction reached an all-time high. The problem was not so much inadequate funding as it was a lack of planning and a negligence of pressing needs. Granted, the educational problems in New York City are great but without good planning there can be neither accountability nor credibility.

The OEO planning projects began in this current period of tightening educational budgets, increasing awareness of the needs of disadvantaged students in higher education, and demands for accountability from the public. In such an atmosphere, planning is an imperative.

Congress has recognized the need for planning, and will soon require coordinated state planning for higher education with establishment of a "1202 Commission" in each state, under the provisions of the Education Amendments of 1972.

Based on the OEO project experiences, a general process model for state and local planning for minority and disadvantaged education can be suggested. The following are the major elements in that process.

A MODEL FOR CHANGE

1. Needs assessment and public discussion of issues. A "need" may be defined in terms of the differences between what exists and what should exist. Whatever the resons for neglect of needs assessment, the national picture is not good. It is doubtful whether a system can ever effectively plan for disadvantaged education let alone win community undertanding and support without undertaking a needs assessment program.

Needs assessment must involve the community. All of the OEO projects recognized that this was essential although they approached involvement in different ways. Without the involvement of the community, many community colleges still indicate that minority/disadvantaged students are not succeeding simply because they are "culturally deprived," "culturally disadvantaged," have "lower-class value systems," or come from "apathetic" backgrounds. In almost every such case, the college has made no consistent effort to find out what was involved in the lack of achievement or high drop-out rates.

The OEO projects generally facilitated increased involvement in local needs assessment (with state needs then generalized from aggregated local needs). The New York project formalized involvement through Local Advisory and Review Committees, with membership extended to representatives of minority groups as well as local government and social agencies such as the Community Action Program, the Labor Department, the Board of Cooperative Educational Services, etc. A less formal approach met with notable success in Illinois. Local community leaders and spokesmen were brought together with college representatives in a free and open exchange of ideas.

Representative of a systems approach to needs assessment is the model developed by Battelle Institute's Center for Improved Education in Columbus, Ohio, to be made available to colleges beginning in late Spring, 1973. The model is part of a larger Battelle project entitled, "Increasing the Effectiveness of Educational Management in Community Colleges." (See appendix A). The basis for Battelle's needs assessment model is a series of questionnaires given to a representative sample of students, graduates, community members, board members, faculty members, and administrators. Results are tabulated and analysed through use of a computer.

2. State goals and objectives for disadvantaged education.

Useful goals are never self-evident simple entities. They need to be explicitly stated, translated into specific measurable objectives, and weighted or prioritized according to their relative importance.

Goals need to be seen as commitments to planned change. They are not simply prosaic statements of the ideal, but are oriented toward action and accomplishment. As an example, the Washington State Board for Community College Education has identified eight broad goals, ranging from, "develop and employ approaches to instruction which will result in efficient and effective learning", to "obtain and make efficient use of human and capital resources". As part of a six-year planning process, these goals and the many objectives generated from them, should provide a framework within which the community colleges and the community college system can be managed with efficiency and effectiveness.

While a number of community college systems have recognized the value of setting state goals and objectives, few have done so for disadvantaged education. Consequently, the formulation of state goals and objectives for disadvantaged education was an important priority in most of the OEO planning projects. The Washington and California projects began by formulating goals and objectives and then prioritized them through use of the "relevance matrix" technique. Basically, this technique involves making a judgement as to the relevance of each objective to each goal and adding up the results on a matrix. The end result is a list of prioritized goals and objectives. (Appendix B describes the relevance matrix technique employed in the Washington OEO project.)

3. Local community college goals, objectives and commitments.

Project Focus, the AACJC's recent study of strategies for change in community colleges, concluded that local colleges are increasingly recognizing the need to set useful goals, and that "there is an emerging consensus on the multiple purposes to be served."*

But the experiences of the OEO planning projects and the National Dissemination project suggest that as of yet few community colleges are setting special goals and priorities for disadvantaged education, even if in some cases they are initiating special programs to serve the needs of disadvantaged students.

In many cases, the OEO projects met institutional resistance to establishing special goals for the disadvantaged. The argument was made that general institutional goals apply to all present and potential students, including minority and disadvantaged students. Unfortunately, because the disadvantaged student often has special needs, it is likely that these needs will be neglected unless special disadvantaged goals and objectives are formulated.

To help colleges in this undertaking, the Florida OEO project developed a "Guide for Local College Planning and Evaluation of Comprehensive Services to the Disadvantaged", in two sections. The first section was a form for listing existing programs for the disadvantaged, the status of these programs, and the number of students and staff involved. This was

---

* Report from Project Focus: Strategies for Change, AACJC, Washington, D.C., 1972, p.55.

followed by a planning checklist of important concerns in five areas identified as basic components in a comprehensive program for the disadvantaged, including college and community commitment, promotion and student enrollment, student services, instruction, and placement and evaluation. (Appendix C).

4. Strategic planning support needs to be provided to local colleges in program development. Recent studies by such researchers as Paul Mort at Columbia University as well as the experience of the OEC National Dissemination Project have shown that a significant time lag continues to exist in education between the formulation of state or institutional goals and policies and the implementation of innovative programs at the institutional level. One major reason for this lag may well be the unavailability of planning support to local colleges.

In college after college visited during this project, it became evident that most innovative changes were planned and instigated by one or two highly committed individuals, working on their own time, outside of the commitments called for by the formal organization. These individuals have had to seek information and help on their own, and their period of probing often extends over several years before program change is even suggested. It is probable that this initial period can be substantially narrowed and the changes of success improved through the provision of strategic planning support to the local college.

Such an approach has been tested with remarkable success in North Carolina as part of the National Laboratory for Higher Education OEO project in that state. The NLHE

strategy was based on two assumptions: (1) Many staff members in community colleges lack the commitment, resources, and skills needed to affect change, and would welcome outside moral and material support, and (2) if changes are to persist after the outside force has withdrawn, staff members within each college must be equipped to provide on-going change support. The OEO project, therefore, consisted of a three-man "Educational Development Team", or EDT, which worked closely with local colleges and provided needed planning support. The EDT also established and trained counterpart EDT's on each college campus, made up of administrative, student support and instructional representatives. After a year of operation, most participating colleges had progressed to a significant degree in developing institutional plans, procedures, and administrative changes to implement instructional change.

These conclusions are supported by Michael Radnor and Robert Coughlan, who note two major requirements for affecting institutional change:* (1) providing receptive staff with training for their change agent roles, and (2) developing support within the institution for the new perspectives that change agents bring into the system.

---

*Michael Radnor and Robert Coughlan, "A training and Development Program for Administrative Change in School Systems," (paper presented at a symposium, Change Process in Education: Some Functional and Structural Implications), Chicago, American Educational Research Organization, April 7, 1972, p.3.

5. Evaluation is an integral part of the planning process though often neglected. Programs need to be evaluated in terms of planning objectives and in terms of client satisfaction. In evaluating the Washington OEO planning project, an attempt was made to appraise both the initiation and catalyst role of the project through a sequence of steps. Basically, the following steps were involved.

   1. Major areas in which progress in minority/disadvantaged education could be expected were identified, such as enrollment, support services, educational programs, etc.
   2. Staff members evaluated progress in the state over the project period in each of these areas, using a rating scale and narrative description.
   3. Staff members evaluated and rated project accomplishments in each area.
   4. An analysis was made of project achievements against state progress in each area to determine the value of the project's contribution.

   Two separate rating scales were developed in assessing project accomplishment. A numerical scale evaluated results, with 0 corresponding to "increasing awareness"; 1 indicating "producing information; 2, "making arrangements"; 3, "finalizing planning"; and 4, "actual (measurable) results." A decimal scale rated effectiveness, with .0 or .1 indicating

very low effectiveness and .8 or .9 indicating the highest level of effectiveness. Combining the scales, a rating of 2.3 would indicate a moderately low level of effectiveness in finalizing planning.

Obviously, there are any number of satisfactory techniques for evaluating a program. The important thing is that evaluation be an explicit process, resulting in acceptance, rejection, change or consolidation.

It should also be remembered that the end of evaluation is the improvement of the educational process, and it is in terms of this end that any evaluation effort can be judged. Hence, a project in evaluation which does not lead to improvements in the processes which are occurring in the college or the system -- no matter how valid its method, how accurate its findings, how impressive its statistical tables -- must be looked upon as a failure.

THE CONTEXT OF PLANNING

Planning, as noted earlier, is not a new process in higher education. What is new is the application of planning to the needs of the disadvantaged, concern over involvement in planning, and the development of new planning techniques.

Several important concerns are suggested by the OEO planning projects in attempting to make planning as meaningful as possible.

1. Planning should always be tied to implementation. Specific developments should be expected as a result of planning. The commitment to act upon goals and objectives is essential.

2. The threat of change should be eliminated as much as possible, by insuring that all planning decisions are well understood. Uncertainty and fear of unanticipated consequences are formidable barriers to change.

3. Planning should avoid being a "zero-sum game", where in order for one group to get what it wants, another group must lose.

4. Planning should involve as many relevant agencies and groups as possible. This helps insure commitment to the final plan.

5. When possible, planning should make use of analogies between situations being dealt with and situations in other locations.

The major conclusion of this report is that change is needed to meet the new needs of minority and disadvantaged students in higher education, and the planning must be in the forefront of reform. Planning must be perceived as a weapon, to be used by and for disadvantaged segments of the community.

The challenge is to local, regional and state systems. What is being called for is more than planning, it is a planning which will serve to involve new groups and facilitate the development of new programs to meet new needs.

APPENDIX A

A SURVEY OF EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

BATTELLE INSTITUTE'S CENTER FOR IMPROVED EDUCATION

ABOUT . . .

A SURVEY OF EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

Regardless of whether you set out to bake a cake or to educate a student, careful planning and implementation are required if the product is to be satisfactory. Whether it be in the kitchen or a college, planning must begin with a systematic assessment of needs. Before you begin baking, you check your recipe to identify the ingredients you desire to use in baking the cake. Then you check your shelves to see what ingredients you already have and finally, identify those you need. The difference between what you have and what you want in order to complete your product is your need. In an analogous manner, educational planners also should be concerned with assessing needs. Before a college can progress from its actual, or present, position to a more desirable one, it must determine the needs that now exist (Step I).

After a planner has thoroughly assessed needs, he or she must follow through with the planning process. For the educator, this means performing four remaining steps.

The planner must determine ways in which the educational system can move from the current state to a more desirable state. This can be accomplished by setting objectives specified in performance terms (Step II).

The planner should consider the alternative approaches for accomplishing the objectives by carefully weighing the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative (Step III). This leads to Step IV in the planning process - selecting the most viable alternative. The alternative most likely to lead to the accomplishment of the objective should be considered within the constraints of the situation. The final step in the planning process consists of the implementation of the chosen alternative (Step V).

This planning approach is fairly new to education, but it has been used for years in business and industry. Because educational planning is becoming increasingly complex, a systematic approach is urgently needed. Furthermore, there is an increasing demand for accountability. By planning in accordance with the previously described five-step process, colleges can be accountable for their processes and products.

More groups want to be (and should be) involved in the educational process. By going to all interested groups, including community members and students, to determine differences between what exists and what is desired, many more people will be included in the planning process. Inasmuch as more people will have a voice in educational planning, the educational system should be able to meet the needs of a greater number of people.

A college is taking the first step in including more people in participative management by going to various groups to assess educational needs. What can the concept of needs assessment, the first step in systematic planning, mean to you as a planner, community member, board member, etc.? To the planner or administrator, it can mean the difference between guessing and knowing what your community, student body, staff, and board feel about the present system and its potential. To the educational community, including the board of trustees, students, and community members, it means knowing that many voices will be heard. It means giving the broad educational community an opportunity to participate in planning for an improved college.

APPENDIX B

A PROPOSED METHOD FOR PRIORITIZING GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTIVITIES*

*This proposal was prepared by the Washington State OEO Project following consultation with the Task Force on Goals and Objectives of the Washington State Board for Community College Education.

A PROPOSED METHOD FOR PRIORITIZING GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND TASKS

SUMMARY

By using a technique adapted from "relevance matrix" analysis, it is possible to prioritize goals, objectives and tasks developed for long-range planning for the community college system in the State of Washington.

The method has the following advantages: (a) it is simple to explain and apply; (b) it allows for both full participation by all interested individuals, and for organizing their subjective inputs in any number of different ways; (c) their results are expressed in a form which allows the later application of advanced techniques such as contingency analysis, Delphi methods, parametric cost studies and "effectiveness measures."

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. This adapted form of "relevance analysis" should be explained to and utilized by, the Steering Committee for community college long-range planning.

2. Trials and demonstrations of this method should be carried out with as many as possible of the Task Forces engaged in community college long-range planning.

3. A strategy for identifying participants, explaining the method to them, and gathering the results using them should be adopted by the Committee for eventual implementation through the State Board for Community College Education staff for planning.

METHOD

1. As a first step, all possible goals, objectives, sub-objectives, tasks and sub-tasks are identified. (Caution: it is absolutely essential that this list be as comprehensive as possible. It is far better to have goals, objectives or tasks listed that are later considered "irrelevant" than to be faced later with items that should not have been overlooked.)

2. Each of the items is assigned a level and all items are listed by level.

   In this case a set of eight goals for the community college system would constitute level I, Number I through VIII; their objectives under each goals would be IA, IB, IC, IIA, IIB, etc.; the tasks would be assigned as IA, I, IA, II, etc.

3. Blank tables are constructed, with each "higher"-level item being assigned in column, and each "lower"-level item being assigned the row.

   An example of a blank table matching goals I through VIII against the objectives under goal I-ie, IA, IB, IC-is given in Diagram I.

4. Each participant is given a set of these blank tables and is asked to fill in the squares, placing 0 where he judges the objective to be irrelevant to the goal, I where he judges it to be relevant.

   The row totals give a measure for the relevance of the objective in relation to the goal; the column total gives the importance of the goals as measured by the stated objectives.

   This process is carried out for all objectives, under goals I through VIII, and the columns are summed through all tables. The totals of the columns can give the importance of the goals against all possible listed objectives.

   An example of a person having filled out the table indicated in Diagram I is given in Diagram II.

5. Similar tables are constructed listing tasks by row, and objectives by columns. The process is repeated, covering all tasks and all objectives.

6. The tables matching successive pairs of "levels" can be multiplied by the mathematical technique known as "matrix multiplication," and the relevance of tasks against overall goals can be determined.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Packets containing the pre-printed tables and descriptions of the numbers items can be prepared before hand, and distributed to a group of participants at a "prioritizing seminar." Following an introducation to the method, it should be possible to record all opinions within a two hour period. Thus, given the cooperation of all participants, this is a very time-saving method with the added advantage that the inputs can be reviewed and analyzed at leisure, rather than at the meeting, if this is necessary.

In our example we used a 0-1 scale because this is easiest for participants to recognize and use. However, other scales could also be used; a 5 point scale, from 0-4, is suggested as an option, since this conforms to the letter-grading principle which academicians are unfortunately very familiar with.

The individual sets of filled up tables can be grouped in any number of different ways. Their values could all be averaged; they could simply be compared, or could be "grouped" by constituencies or special-interest viewpoints. If each set is coded, analysts could have the freedom to group entries in any manner they please, to arrive at different configurations of opinion.

If the format is carefully followed, it can be used at a later stage in conjunction with cost tables, PPBS-Type budget formats, and contingency matrices. Evaluation of individual items for detail examination becomes possible.

Where major disagreements exist, Delphi can be utilized to narrow down differences of opinion or evaluation. Delphi is very time consuming, but prior use of this technique isolates critical areas and problems where Delphi analysis is needed.

DIAGRAM I: RELEVANCE MATRIX FORM

OVERALL GOALS

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	
IA									OBJECTIVES A, B, C UNDER GOAL NUMBER ONE
IB									
IC									

DIAGRAM II: RELEVANCE MATRIX COMPLETED FOR ONE SET OF OBJECTIVES

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	
IA	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	=4
IB	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	=6
IC	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	=7
	=3	=1	=2	=1	=3	=3	=3	=1	

RELEVANCE OF OBJECTIVES OF GOAL I AGAINST ALL GOALS.

IMPORTANCE OF ALL GOALS AGAINST OBJECTIVES OF GOAL I:
3(Highest): I, V, VI, VII;
2(Intermediate): III;
1(Lowest): II, IV, VIII.

APPENDIX C

STATE OF FLORIDA

GUIDE FOR LOCAL COLLEGE PLANNING AND EVALUATION OF COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES TO THE DISADVANTAGED

GUIDE FOR LOCAL COLLEGE PLANNING AND EVALUATION

OF

COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES TO THE DISADVANTAGED

PART I: CHECKLIST FOR PLANNING COMMUNITY COLLEGE SERVICES FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

PART II: PROJECTIONS FOR PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

PART I

PROJECTIONS FOR PROGRAMS

FOR THE

DISADVANTAGED

DIVISION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
Tallahassee
1971

PROJECTIONS FOR PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

COLLEGE_____ FY 19___ - ___

OFFICIAL PREPARING REPORT_____ DATE OF REPORT_____197__

CO-ORDINATOR OF PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED_____ PAGE_____OF_____PAGES

NAME OF PROGRAM	COLLEGE PROGRAM DIRECTOR & OFFICE PHONE	STATUS			MAJOR PURPOSE OF PROGRAM								NO. OF FTE		CHARACT. OF STUD.	
		CONTINUING	WILL IMPLEMENT	AWAITING FUNDING	FIN. AID	RECRUITING	COMPENSATORY	CRITICAL SKILL	AFFECTIVE	PLACEMENT	OTHER		STAFF	STUDENTS	MINORITY	POVERTY

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING: PROJECTIONS FOR PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

1. HEADING: Fill in completely on first page. Continuation sheets need college and date only.

2. NAME OF PROGRAM: The local name is sufficient if the program has been established and reported previously. If a new program (first time reported), attach a separate sheet (or copy of the proposal) giving:
   a. Local program title.
   b. Generic or descriptive title.
   c. Federal title or other source of funding.
   d. Outside funding or coordinating agency.
   e. Brief description of purpose.
   f. Brief description of participants.

3. COLLEGE PROGRAM DIRECTOR: Give the name of the supervisor or coordinator most directly responsible for the operation of the program. List his telephone extension or, if a separate line, his office telephone.

4. STATUS: Check appropriate column.
   a. Continuing: Program is in operation.
   b. Will implement: Program has been funded.
   c. Awaiting Funding: Program has been approved at the local level and is awaiting state or federal approval or funding.

5. MAJOR PURPOSE OF PROGRAM: Check the appropriate column if program serves one purpose only or number the columns in order of their major emphasis if the program serves more than one purpose. (Use 1 for most emphasis, then 2,3,4,etc. for functions of less emphasis.)
   a. Financial Aid: Any program that will help the students with their expenses while attending college. Include goods and services as well as cash.
   b. Recruiting: Any part of the process of communicating with the target population and bringing them into a college program.
   c. Compensatory: Any educational process designed to upgrade a deficient skill as defined by the standards of the individual college.
   d. Critical Skill: An occupational area in which a shortage of trained workers has been declared at federal, state or local level; for example, police science, certain health related technologies and certain teaching specialities have received special funding to stimulate interest.
   e. Affective: Programs designed to improve self-concepts and attitudes and directed to any element of the college population.
   f. Placement: Any part of the process of matching students to career jobs or assisting disadvantaged students in gaining entrance and financial assistance to an institution of higher learning.

6. NUMBER OF FTE: Use projected enrollments as of the beginning of the fall term.

7. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS: Use an estimated percentage in either or both columns.
   a. Minority: Any minority population which is disadvantaged by reason of their status in the local community.
   b. Poverty: If poverty guidelines are spelled out in the specifications of the funding authority, follow those guidelines. If no other guidelines are mandatory, use current OEO poverty income guidelines.

1971.

PART II

CHECKLIST FOR PLANNING COMMUNITY COLLEGE SERVICES

FOR THE

DISADVANTAGED

DIVISION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
Tallahassee
1971

DIRECTIONS FOR USE OF CHECKLIST FOR PLANNING SERVICES FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

This Checklist for Planning should be used as a guide for on-campus planning rather than a questionnaire for submission to the Division of Community Colleges. While each of the basic components of a comprehensive program for the disadvantaged has been included, it should be emphasized that the value of this document lies in the guidance it provides in the annual planning process. Optimum benefits will accrue only if many segments of the college community are involved. Inputs and reactions from administrators, faculty members, students, trustees, and community citizens promote planning which leads to full commitment to goals and objectives.

The various items in no way suggest that there is "a best way" for achieving an objective. All of the colleges in the system are searching for better solutions for problems; it is essential that this experimentation continue if expanded opportunities for the disadvantaged are to be identified. Moreover, analysis of the programs operant in the community college system indicates that diametrically opposed solutions to many problems are being attempted. The Checklist is designed to insure that a college utilizing a given technique thoroughly understands the ramifications of its approach. Then, after detailed study and deliberation, the college should proceed with confidence to develop programs which are consistent within its philosophy. It is therefore considered proper for the college to reject those techniques which do not conform to its objectives.

As the staff of the college proceeds with its annual and long range planning, each item should be carefully analyzed and one of four responses checked. Reactions to the "yes-no" options should be as follows:

Yes 1: Program, technique or concept currently in operation or a firm commitment to implement.

Yes 2: Program, technique or concept is high priority item. Tentative commitment to implement if at all possible.

No 3: Program, technique or concept is low priority item. Impractical to implement in near future.

No 4: Program, technique or concept is contrary to philosophy of college. Other methods are used to achieve the desired results.

A space for Comments is included after each item. Colleges are requested to qualify their answers in any way which would be helpful to another institution attempting to understand the philosophy reflected.

PART I

CHECKLIST FOR PLANNING SERVICES FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

		19 - (Current Year)*				
		Yes 1	Yes 2	No 3	No 4	Comment
I.	College and Community Commitment					
A.	Our college has a written statement of its responsibilities specifically to the disadvantaged.					
1.	Approved or reviewed by the Administration	1				
2.	Approved or reviewed by the Board of Trustees	2				
3.	Approved or reviewed by Citizens Advisory Committee	3				
4.	Approved or reviewed by the Faculty	4				
5.	Approved or reviewed by the students	5				
B.	Our college involves many segments of the college and community in planning its comprehensive programs for the disadvantaged.					
1.	Approved or reviewed by the Administration	1				
2.	Approved or reviewed by the Board of Trustees	2				
3.	Approved or reviewed by the Citizens Advisory Committee	3				
4.	Approved or reviewed by the Faculty	4				
5.	Approved or reviewed by the Students	5				
C.	Our college submits its Checklist for Planning services for the disadvantaged for review annually by various segments of the college and community.					
1.	Administration	1				
2.	Board of Trustees	2				
3.	Citizens Advisory Committee	3				
4.	Faculty	4				
5.	Students	5				

*This draft of the Checklist provides space for evaluation of current year activities only. The working document will provide space for checking planned activities over the three-year period. (See page 5 for sample)

CHECKLIST FOR PLANNING SERVICES FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

19__-__ (Budget Year)

	Yes 1	Yes 2	No 3	No 4	Number	Costs	Comments
A							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
B							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
-C							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							

19__-__ Planning Year(s)

	Yes 1	Yes 2	No 3	No 4	Number	Costs	Comments
I-A							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
I-B							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
I-C							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							

		Yes 1	Yes 2	No 3	No 4	Comment
D.	Our college has staff development projects to increase effectiveness with the disadvantaged					
1.	Workshops for specialists in working with the disadvantaged					
2.	Workshops for counselors of the disadvantaged					
3.	Workshops for non-teaching staff					
4.	Consultants					
5.	Literature disseminated to staff					
6.	Information about community dispersed through					
a.	Lectures or workshops					
b.	Visitations					
7.	Other _____					
E.	Our college finds ways to attract minority staff.					
1.	Has planned program for hiring minorities					
2.	Offers released time for professional upgrading for minorities					
3.	Other _____					
II.	Promotion and Student Enrollment (Recruitment)					
A.	Our college makes its services available to many segments of the disadvantaged population.					
1.	Waives high school diploma requirement for adults					
2.	Offers ethnic studies courses					
3.	Offers short courses					
4.	Offers academic courses in					
a.	Student's native language					
b.	English as a second language					
5.	Other _____					

CHECKLIST FOR PLANNING SERVICES FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

		Yes 1	Yes 2	No 3	No 4	Comment
B. Our college provides easy access to:						
1. off-campus instruction centers and has information centers	1					
2. transportation available to college	2					
3. centers located in poverty areas	3					
4. special study centers on campus	4					
5. self-instructional materials for use at home	5					
6. educational T.V. or radio	6					
7. Other _____	7					
C. Our college makes it easy to enroll.						
1. Simple application form	1					
2. Easily identifiable place of registration	2					
3. Registration by mail	3					
4. Does not discourage late applicant	4					
5. Positive, helpful staff attitude	5					
6. Professional counseling assistance	6					
7. Aides to assist enrollee with paper work	7					
8. Other _____	8					
D. Our college has a system for identifying target groups.						
1. Citizens advisory committee	1					
2. Community agencies	2					
3. Public school counselors	3					
4. College committee	4					
5. Student clubs and fraternities	5					
6. Recruiter	6					
7. Social worker	7					
8. Other	8					

		Yes 1	Yes 2	No 3	No 4	Comment
E.	Our college uses the media to inform the target population about post high school educational opportunities.					
	1. Newspaper					
	a. Local	1a				
	b. College	1b				
	2. Radio	2				
	3. Television	3				
	4. Pulpit announcements	4				
	5. Handbills	5				
	6. Billboard	6				
	7. Other _____	7				
F.	Our college has developed recruitment goals for the disadvantaged.					
	1. Total	1				
	2. Minorities					
	a. Black	2a				
	b. Indian	2b				
	c. Spanish speaking	2c				
	d. Other _____	2d				
G.	Our college uses appropriate techniques for placement					
	1. Occupational curricula	1				
	2. Basic skills (reading, writing, computation)	2				
	3. Learning styles	3				
	4. Other _____	4				
H.	Our college has programs and activities which appeal to the disadvantaged.					
	1. Athletics	1				
	2. Drama	2				
	3. Music	3				
	4. Art	4				
	5. Nursing and health related occupations	5				
	6. Other _____	6				

		Yes 1	Yes 2	No 3	No 4	Comment
III. Student Services						
A. Our college has procedures for distribution of financial aid funds which do not penalize the disadvantaged student.						
1. Simple application form	1					
2. Minimum confidential statement from parents/guardians	2					
3. Lenient application deadlines	3					
4. Assistance in filling out forms	4					
5. Funds for part-time and non-credit students	5					
6. Campaign to publicize available funds	6					
7. Other _____	7					
B. Our college has a staff and a plan to actively seek funds and services from public and private sources.						
1. Community financial aid committee	1					
2. Financial aid director						
a. Full time	2a					
b. Part time	2b					
3. College financial aid committee	3					
4. College foundation	4					
5. Other _____	5					
C. Our college has an effective program for counseling students with personal and academic problems.						
1. Group counseling	1					
2. Minority counselors	2					
3. Counseling sessions in the home	3					
4. Required sessions with a counselor	4					
5. Mobile counseling units	5					
6. Other _____	6					

		Yes 1	Yes 2	No 3	No 4	Comment
D. Our college offers health services to disadvantaged students.						
1. Has on campus or referral to outside clinics for:						
a. Free physical exams	1a					
b. Psychological exams	1b					
c. Chronic illness	1c					
d. Teeth	1d					
e. Eyes	1e					
f. Hearing	1f					
g. Speech	1g					
h. Drugs	1h					
i. Other _____	1i					
2. Has health personnel on campus.						
a. Health counseling	2a					
b. Nurse to screen health inventories	2b					
c. Doctor for consultation	2c					
d. Other _____	2d					
E. Our college offers financial aid to needy students.						
1. Waives fees for all remedial or compensatory courses below college level	1					
2. Waives fees for disadvantaged students regardless of course level	2					
3. Has grants, loans, and scholarships						
a. Federal	3a					
b. State	3b					
c. Emergency loan fund	3c					
4. Other _____	4					

		Yes 1	Yes 2	No 3	No 4	Comment
F. Our college has an on-going orientation program.						
1. Is not degrading	1					
2. Develops rapport between students and staff	2					
3. Assists student to assess his goals and objectives	3					
4. Helps student form good study and work habits	4					
5. Attempts to modify student attitude toward the disadvantaged	5					
6. Other _____	6					
IV. Instruction						
A. Our college provides opportunity for the disadvantaged student to utilize various modes of instruction to fit his learning style.						
1. Individualized instruction	1					
2. Self-paced instruction	2					
3. General interest seminars	3					
4. Individual or small group tutoring	4					
5. Learning by tutoring others	5					
6. CAI and Computer managed instruction	6					
7. Multi-media presentation	7					
8. Audio-tutorial programs	8					
9. Instructional modules	9					
10. Learning laboratory	10					
11. Illustrated lectures	11					
12. College developed materials	12					
13. Supervised work experience	13					
14. Other _____	14					

CHECKLIST FOR PLANNING SERVICES FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

		Yes 1	Yes 2	No 3	No 4	Comment
B.	Our college identifies possible causes for learning deficiencies or low test scores by analysis of:					
	1. Physical exams	1				
	2. Psychological exams	2				
	3. Reading tests	3				
	4. Public school or agency data	4				
	5. Other _____	5				
C.	Our college makes it possible for the disadvantaged student to become successful					
	1. Non-punitive grading policy	1				
	2. Flexible class scheduling	2				
	3. Individualized instruction	3				
	4. Self-paced instruction	4				
	5. Tutorial services	5				
	6. Other _____	6				
D.	Our college designs its learning processes to the benefit of the disadvantaged student					
	1. Has flexible time limit for course completion	1				
	2. Has flexible time limit for course entrance	2				
	3. Provides rapid feedback to the students	3				
	4. Provides opportunities to reinforce and stimulate learning					
	a. concrete as opposed to abstract	4a				
	b. relevant as defined by student and instructor	4b				
	5. Provides outside support to disadvantaged students with tutoring by					
	a. students	5a				
	b. faculty	5b				
	c. extra seminar sessions	5c				
	6. Provides structured techniques to keep student interested in his program and activities	6				
	7. Other _____	7				

		Yes 1	Yes 2	No 3	No 4	Comment
E. Our college offers appropriately organized remedial courses to eliminate academic deficiencies.						
1. Avoids stigmatizing the student	1					
2. Writes catalog description in positive manner	2					
3. Allows students to take remedial courses concurrently with college level courses	3					
4. Segregates the underachiever from those with adequate background by:						
a. individualized instruction	4a					
b. remedial courses (with college credit)	4b					
c. remedial courses (without college credit)	4c					
5. Offered in several areas:						
a. Reading	5a					
b. Communications	5b					
c. Computative skills	5c					
6. Other _____	6					
F. Our college has activities designed to improve the student's self-concept.						
1. Ethnic studies						
a. Integrated approach	1a					
b. Separate approach	1b					
2. Ethnic cultural presentations	2					
3. Ethnic clubs or group meetings	3					
4. Ethnic collections in the library	4					
5. Other _____	5					

		Yes 1	Yes 2	No 3	No 4	Comment
V. Placement and Evaluation						
A. Our college has a program for evaluating the success or failure of its programs for the disadvantaged.						
1. Studies of costs	1					
2. Studies of success or failure	2					
3. Studies of effectiveness of out-reach programs and recruiting efforts	3					
4. Follow-up studies of individual students						
a. After graduation	4a					
b. Upon dropping out	4b					
c. After placement in a job	4c					
d. Upon transfer to another institution	4d					
e. Studies of academically deficient students not in special programs	4e					
5. Other _____	5					
B. Our college offers job placement services and referrals.						
1. Disadvantaged students placed in college jobs (non-CWSP)	1					
2. Disadvantaged students placed in community jobs (non-CWSP)	2					
3. Graduates	3					
4. Non-graduates	4					
5. Has referral system to agencies						
a. Government	5a					
b. Private	5b					
c. On-campus recruitment by industry with equal opportunity practices	5c					
6. Other _____	6					